

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

<p>Janet R.,<sup>1</sup></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">vs.</p> <p>Kilolo Kijakazi, Acting Commissioner of Social Security Administration,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>Civil Action No.: 2:22-cv-4060-SAL</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold; margin-top: 100px;">ORDER</p>
--	--	--

Plaintiff brought this action pursuant to Section 205(g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), to obtain judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying her claim for disability insurance benefits (“DIB”) and supplemental security income (“SSI”) pursuant the Social Security Act. [ECF No. 1.] In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker for pretrial matters.

On November 1, 2023, the magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that the Commissioner’s decision be reversed under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further proceedings. [ECF No. 14.] Objections to the Report were due on November 15, 2023. No objections were filed.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court is charged with

---


<sup>1</sup> The Committee on Court Administration and Case Management of the Judicial Conference of the United States has recommended due to significant privacy concerns in social security cases that federal courts refer to claimants only by their first name and last initials in court opinions.

making a de novo determination of only those portions of the Report that have been specifically objected to, and the court may accept, reject, or modify the Report, in whole or in part. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of objections, the court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report and must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the Report, the applicable law, and the record of this case in accordance with the above standard, the court finds no clear error, adopts the Report, and incorporates the Report by reference herein. Accordingly, the decision denying Plaintiff’s DIB and SSI is **REVERSED**, and the court **REMANDS** this matter for further consideration pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

December 28, 2023  
Columbia, South Carolina

  
Sherri A. Lydon  
United States District Judge